UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,829	06/28/2001	Raja Krishnaswamy	MS174293.1	5228

27195	7590	12/11/2003	

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	4

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3.   Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cohen

et al. (6,324,543) (hereinafter Cohen).

4.   AS per claim 1, Cohen discusses a system for interacting with an object, the

system comprising: a method call interceptor operable to intercept a method call to an

object and to route the method call to a proxy, the method call interceptor accessible to

application code (e.g. col. 2, lines 1-10); and an application code generic proxy operable

to receive an intercepted method call, the application code generic proxy further

operable to invoke a method on the object, to receive results from the object and to

pass results to the entity that generated the intercepted method call (e.g. col. 7, lines 1-

12).

5.   As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

6.   As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

7.   As per claim 23, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

8.   As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

9.   As per claim 2, Cohen explains the system where the object is located across a

remoting boundary (e.g. col. 2, lines 1-10).

10.   As per claim 20, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

11.   As per claim 3, Cohen shows the system where the object is marshaled by

reference (e.g. col. 5, lines 61-67).

12.   As per claim 21, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

13.   As per claim 4, Cohn shows the system where the object is marshaled by value

(e.g. col. 1, lines 24-32. in the preferred embodiment Cohen uses Java to create and

instantiate the objects, it is an inherent property of Java to marshal objects by value).

14.   As per claim 22, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

15.   As per claim 5, Cohen describes the system where the method call interceptor is

further operable to populate a call information data store with information associated

with the intercepted method call, the call information data store accessible to the

application code generic proxy (e.g. col. 6, lines 62-67).

16.   As per claim 24, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

17.   As per claim 6, Cohen describes the system where the call information data store

is populated with at least one of a method name, one or more input parameters, a count

of the number of input parameters, one or more type identifiers associated with the input

parameters, a count of the number of return parameters for the method call, one or

more type identifiers associated with the return parameters, class/interface defining

method data, a stack pointer and a heap pointer (e.g. col. 7, lines 1-17).

18.   As per claim 25, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

19.   As per claim 7, Cohen shows the system where the call information data store is

a message object that can be serialized and passed across a remoting boundary (e.g.

col. 7, lines 40-60).

20.   As per claim 26, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

21.   As per claim 8, Cohen shows the system where the method call interceptor is

further operable to transfer control to a method in the application code generic proxy,

where the method in the application code generic proxy overrides a base class method

defined in a base class object from which the application code generic proxy inherits

(e.g. col. 9, lines 1-20).

22.   As per claim 9, Cohen describes the system where the application code generic

proxy is operable to perform proxy pre-processing before invoking the method on the

object (e.g. col. 6, lines 57-67).

23.   As per claim 16, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

24.   As per claim 10, Cohen describes the system where the proxy pre-processing

comprises at least one of load-balancing, transaction processing, object migration,

object persisting, monitoring remote method calls, caching remote data, controlling

remote method call invocations and machine learning involved in optimizing remote

method call invocation (e.g. col. 5, lines 61-67).

25.   As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

26.   As per claim 11, Cohen describes the system where the application code generic

proxy is operable to perform proxy post-processing after receiving the results from the

object (e.g. col. 7, lines 8-16).

27.   As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

28.   As per claim 12, Cohen describes the system where the proxy-processing

comprises at least one of auditing, transaction processing, object migration, object

persisting, monitoring remote method calls, caching local data, caching remote data,

controlling remote method call invocations and machine learning involved in optimizing

remote method call invocation (e.g. col. 7, lines 8-12).

29.   As per claim 19, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

As per claim 13, Cohen describes the system where the application code generic proxy

invokes the method on the object by invoking a method available in a remoting

infrastructure (e.g. col. 8, lines 18-23).

Conclusion

30.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

US Patent number 5,732,270 to Foody et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5484.

fm

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100